

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/598,299	RIJPEKEMA, EDWIN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Paul Masur	2464	

All Participants:

(1) Paul Masur.

(2) Mike Scaturro.

Date of Interview: 2 December 2009

Status of Application: Pending

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 10 AM

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____.

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

102e

Claims discussed:

1 and 11

Prior art documents discussed:

Radulescu et al. (US PG Pub 2006/0041889), Goossens (US PG Pub 2006/0095920), Radulescu et al. (US PG Pub 2006/0041888)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Paul Masur/
Examiner, Art Unit 2464

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner contacted the applicant's representative in regard to potentially expediting prosecution through an examiner's amendment. The examiner discussed the current claims with the attorney on 12/2/2009. During this time the examiner disclosed, to the applicant's representative, several references that had a common assignee with the instant application. In light of dependent claims that were previously identified as allowable and the references identified, the examiner inquired if the applicant's representative would be amenable to either a) incorporate claims previously indicated as allowable into the independent claims or b) receive a final rejection using one or a combination of the identified references.

On 12/3/2009, the examiner and the applicant's representative spoke on the phone. It was during this conversation that the applicant's representative requested an action from the examiner. Finally, the examiner thanked the applicant's representative for his time.